On the incoherence of Nothingness and the natural ascent of Being

Benjamin James

December 3, 2025

Nothingness is the most abused word in the human vocabulary. We use it casually, as if nothingness were simply a thin, delicate version of the world. We imagine an empty room, a quiet moment, or a blank canvas. In daily speech, nothingness is just the absence of some particular thing, but the philosophical question of "nothingness" demands something radically different. It demands the absence of all things; all structure, all laws, all time, all possibility, all conditions that could give anything the capacity to exist. True nothingness is not emptiness; it is the collapse of the very framework within which emptiness could be meaningful. Once carried to its proper conclusion, it reveals itself to be an incoherent concept. Something that cannot exist, cannot persist, and cannot even be meaningfully conceived. The task, then, is not to explain why something emerged from nothing, but to understand why nothingness was never a viable alternative in the first place.

To begin, it helps to articulate a contrast that even a child understands instinctively. Some things hold together, and some things fall apart. A sandcastle eventually erodes; a star eventually exhausts its fuel; a thought eventually fades. Everything seems to drift toward disorder unless some stabilizing force pushes back. This drift toward disorder has a name, entropy. It is the tendency of things to unravel, disperse, or collapse into a state where nothing is organized. Entropy is not an enemy; it is simply the baseline tendency of any system that is not actively holding itself together. Entropy disintegrates. The opposing tendency, the ability of something to stay intact, is what I call coherence. Coherence is not a mystical force. It is simply the capacity of a structure to resist falling apart, to reinforce itself, to remain identifiable as a structure across time. Entropy destroys pattern; coherence preserves it. Seen this way, coherence is "staying-together," and entropy is "coming-apart."

This contrast is useful because it grounds our metaphysics in something immediately intuitive. You do not need to understand physics to see that a snowflake is delicate but stable, or that a fragile glass sculpture persists only so long as nothing disturbs it. Coherence

is the cluster of properties that let a thing remain the thing it is. In biological organisms, coherence is maintained through metabolic repair. In societies, coherence is maintained through norms and institutions. In thought, coherence is maintained through repeated reinforcement or meaning. Every domain has its own version of staying-together. And if something has even a slight ability to maintain itself, if it has any structural integrity whatsoever, it will resist the tendency to dissolve entirely.

Nothingness, however, is a state in which not only do structures fail to exist, but no processes exist to maintain them, no laws exist to enforce absence, and no dynamics exist to sustain the absence of dynamics. Nothingness is the imagined endpoint of entropy carried to infinity. This analogy, though, breaks down the moment you push it. Entropy acts on existing things; it cannot describe the "state" of a world with no things. Entropy is a measure of disorder relative to some reference of order. Nothingness has no reference. It is not more disordered than something; it is outside the space where "order" or "disorder" could even be meaningful. Entropy requires a system to act on. Nothingness, if real, would not be a system. This is the first major fracture in the concept of pure nothing; it lacks the preconditions for entropy to be defined.

The second fracture arises from the notion of persistence. For nothingness to be a genuine metaphysical competitor to being, it must be capable of persisting. That is, if the universe were ever truly nothing, it must have the capacity to remain nothing, but to remain anything at all, whether being or non-being, requires stability of some form. Persistence requires a mechanism, law, or rule that ensures continuity. In physics, this would be analogous to inertia; in logic, it would be analogous to identity; in metaphysics, it would be the principle that a state maintains itself across whatever stands for time. Nothingness cannot contain a principle. It cannot host a rule, because rules are structures. A rule that "nothing remains nothing" is itself something; therefore, it cannot exist in nothing. Nothingness cannot contain the law of its own persistence. Without this, it cannot remain nothing even as a hypothetical.

Thus, the very idea that nothingness could "continue" being nothing is already a conceptual mistake. Continuation requires time, and nothingness has no time. It requires a substrate,

and nothingness has none. It requires a framework within which persistence can be said to occur, and nothingness has no such framework. There is no temporal dimension in which nothingness can persist. There is no relational field within which absence can be maintained. Nothingness cannot "last," because lasting is a behavior. Behaviors are attributes of systems. Nothingness cannot be a system. The notion collapses under its own weight.

This insight begins to reshape the oldest metaphysical question: "Why is there something rather than nothing?" The question is constructed on the assumption that nothingness is a stable alternative, a real possibility that could have obtained instead of being. But if nothingness is not stable, coherent, or definable as a state, then the question becomes malformed. It assumes the legitimacy of one side of a dichotomy that cannot stand. We recognize the error clearly when we think in terms of coherence and entropy. Something that has even the smallest capacity for self-maintenance will tend to persist. Something with absolutely no capacity to maintain itself will fail to persist. Nothingness has no structure to maintain or dissolve; it is not in the running. It cannot persist because it cannot instantiate the conditions for persistence. Therefore, the dichotomy between being and nothingness is not symmetrical. Being is a coherent structure; nothingness is a conceptual limit that cannot stabilize.

This is where the Reality Equation finds its philosophical role. The equation, written in its simplest form as

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = \Gamma C^n - \lambda C,$$

describes the dynamic tension between coherence (staying-together) and entropy (falling-apart) in any system that exists. If the self-reinforcing term ΓC^{n} exceeds the entropy leakage λC, the system maintains or increases its degree of organization. If it does not, the system dissolves. This equation is not a metaphysical claim about the birth of the universe; it is a general condition for the persistence of structure once structure exists. It applies to stars, ecosystems, ideas, institutions, anything that has identifiable form. The equation does not attempt to describe nothingness because nothingness cannot host the variables involved. Nothingness has no C to track, no entropy to leak, and no feedback to amplify. A framework

for being cannot be applied to non-being. The equation does, however, point to something crucial. Once coherence appears at all, once any structure acquires even a minimal capacity to maintain itself, it becomes more stable than the total absence of structure.

This asymmetry is the philosophical pivot point. Nothingness cannot reinforce itself. Something can. Nothingness cannot stabilize. Something can. Nothingness cannot persist. Something can. Therefore, once structure appears, persistence is not surprising. Collapse to nothingness is not a meaningful trajectory; it is the negation of trajectories. The Reality Equation does not claim to prove that coherence must arise, only that once it does, it tends to dominate, and this is enough to explain why existence is unsurprising while nothingness is incoherent.

This helps us reevaluate major philosophical traditions with sharper conceptual tools. Classical metaphysics often treats nothingness as a real ontological possibility, a backdrop against which being must justify itself, but this presupposes that nothingness is a coherent state. Heidegger famously asked why there is being rather than nothing, but even he wrestled with expressing the nature of nothingness without importing structure into it. Parmenides dismissed the idea of non-being as unthinkable, declaring that only being can be. In modern physics, claims that the universe emerged from "nothing" turn out to be claims about emergence from a quantum vacuum, a state with laws, fields, and symmetries, not nothingness. Throughout history, nothingness has been smuggled back into being under different names. Emptiness, void, vacuum, space, lack. But each of these has properties. Each has rules. Each has structure. And thus, none of them is nothing.

Understanding the impossibility of nothingness also clarifies the role entropy plays in the evolution of the universe. Entropy increases within systems that are not actively sustained, but entropy does not drive systems toward nothingness. It drives them toward states of reduced internal structure within the framework of being. A star exhausts its fuel and collapses into a white dwarf or neutron star. A culture falls into disorder and reorganizes or dissolves into other cultures. These transitions happen within the arena of existence. Entropy can degrade structure, but it cannot eliminate being. It cannot extinguish the fabric

of reality because it operates on structures, not on the category of existence itself. Nothingness is not the end result of entropy; it is a state that entropy cannot even describe.

If entropy cannot take us to nothingness, and if coherence can maintain structure once structure exists, then the natural trajectory of the universe is a dynamic interplay between falling-apart forces and staying-together forces. Coherence organizes, entropy disorganizes, and reality develops as the tension between the two. The baseline of this interplay is existence, not nothingness. Coherence does not need to emerge from nothing; it merely needs to outpace entropy once present. The real metaphysical puzzle is not "Why is there something rather than nothing?" but "Why did coherence arise at all?" This question is narrower, more precise, and does not rely on the false assumption that nothingness is a viable alternative.

What, then, is the metaphysical status of nothingness? It is not a state the universe could have been in. It is not a condition that could have persisted. It is not a baseline from which existence somehow deviated. It is a conceptual shadow cast by the grammar of subtraction, a mistaken extrapolation of everyday emptiness into a domain where emptiness no longer applies. Nothingness is not the opposite of being; it is the failure of the conceptual apparatus that allows us to talk about being. It is not a metaphysical competitor; it is an error of category.

Accepting this does not solve every philosophical question, but it clears away one of our deepest confusions. It allows us to see that existence, once possible, is not puzzling. Persistence is what structures do. Falling apart is what structures fail to avoid. Nothingness is what we mistakenly imagine at the limit of falling apart, even though the concept of the limit contradicts the concept of nothing. If anything emerges with even a rudimentary ability to resist dissolution, if coherence exists at even the smallest scale, then the universe will develop structure. Coherence amplifies; entropy dilutes. Neither implies a return to nothingness. Being is the field in which these dynamics play out. Nothingness is not a field at all.

We are left, then, with a clearer framing. The dichotomy between being and nothingness was always an illusion. Nothingness is not the mirror image of being. It is the collapse of the

mirror. Once this is recognized, the Reality Equation is not speculative metaphysics or explanatory overreach. It is simply a formal expression of the fact that structures that stay together will continue to exist, and structures that fall apart will not. Existence persists by default not because something overpowered nothingness, but because nothingness was never capable of persistence. The surprising thing would not be that something exists, it would be if nothingness ever could. Once we understand the true nature of nothingness, we see that it could not. Being is the only stable ontological condition because it is the only condition at all.

References

James, B. (2025). The Reality Equation: Why Existence is the Default Condition of the Universe. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTRE-4